

Koichiro MAEMURA, S.N. 09/653,994
Page 22

Dkt. No. 2271/62975

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated November 1, 2006 in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 1-42 were pending. By this Amendment, new claim 45 has been added to clarify the subject matter of claim 1. Support for claim 45 can be found on pages 35-36 of the specification. Accordingly, claims 1-42 and 45 are pending upon entry of this Amendment, with claims 1-4, 17-20 and 39-42 being in independent form.

Claims 1-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,293,253 to Kida et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,721,071 to Maruyama.

Applicant has carefully considered the Examiner's comments and the cited art, and respectfully submits that independent claims 1-4, 17-20 and 39-42 as amended are patentable over the cited art, for at least the following reasons.

The present application relates to a communication terminal device which can handle unwanted communications, while minimizing consumption of resources. Applicant devised an improved communication terminal device configured with a function of rejecting receipt of messages from communication partners who are not registered in a receipt-allowed communication partner registration table. In addition to rejecting the unwanted message from the communication partner not registered in the receipt-allowed communication partner registration table, communication control information is collected and stored in connection with each rejected message. At a later time, a list can be created on the basis of the stored communication control information for the rejected messages, and visibly output. The list can show a plurality of rejected communications from the receipt-rejected communication partner including for each rejected communication from the receipt-rejected communication partner the date and time of the rejected communication. Each of independent claims 1-4, 17-20 and 39-42 addresses these features, as well as additional features.

The Examiner acknowledged that it is not explicit whether Kida teaches or suggests a list of image information showing a plurality of receipt-rejected communication partners. Figure 12 of Kida, as cited by the Examiner, shows the reporting of a single reception rejection from a receipt-rejected communication partner.

In contrast, in the subject matter of the present application, the list of image information created shows a plurality of rejected communications from a receipt-rejected communication

Koichiro MAEMURA, S.N. 09/653,994
Page 23

Dkt. No. 2271/62975

partner. Figure 12 of Kida teaches away from a stated objective of the subject matter of the present application, that is, providing a list of rejected communications from a receipt-rejected communication partner, so as to avoid wasteful paper usage from output of a one-page report for each receipt rejection, as discussed at pages 35-36 of the present application. Figure 12 of Kida suggests output of just such a report per rejection which is simply wasteful and unnecessary.

Alternatively, Kida (column 10, lines 28-29) proposes the synthesis of a report listing calling stations that have been rejected. This is also different from the subject matter of the present application, wherein for each receipt-rejected communication partner, the list of image information (created by the communication control list creating medium) shows a plurality of rejected communications from the receipt-rejected communication partner including for each rejected communication from the receipt-rejected communication partner the date and time of the rejected communication.

Maruyama, as understood by the Applicant, proposes a facsimile apparatus allowing registration of a telephone number of a calling device to specify rejection of communications from that calling device.

Although Maruyama proposes a facsimile which includes a communication management record table (see Maruyama, Figure 7 and column 5, lines 43-49), the table proposed in Maruyama is conventional and is different from the list of image that shows for a receipt-rejected communication partner, a plurality of rejected communications from the receipt-rejected communication partner including for each rejected communication from that receipt-rejected communication partner the date and time of the rejected communication information, as provided by the subject matter of the present application.

The communication management record table in Figure 7 of Maruyama, cited in the Office Action, simply saves in reverse chronological order a record of normal communication control information relating to transmission and receipt performed on the device, and the information is presented conventionally. Specifically, the "Result of Communication" column in Figure 7 records whether the transmission or receipt was properly performed (see column 5, lines 62-64). For example, in Figure 7 of Maruyama, communication number 4 is recorded as an attempted transmission to communication partner 0311114444 in which the transmission was not properly performed and was recorded as "NG".

Koichiro MAEMURA, S.N. 09/653,994
Page 24

Dkt. No. 2271/62975

Applicant respectfully submits that a record of normal communication control information, as portrayed in Figure 7 of Maruyama, does not provide motivation for collecting communication control information regarding the communication relating to receipt rejection and providing a list such that for a receipt-rejected communication partner, said list shows a plurality of rejected communication from the receipt-rejected communication partner including for each rejected communication from the receipt-rejected communication partner the date and time of the rejected communication.

The other embodiments of Maruyama also fail to teach or suggest the claimed subject matter of the present application. Specifically, the third embodiment in Maruyama proposes rejection of reception from a calling device when the telephone number of that calling device is set as one in which data transmission should be rejected. In contrast, in the present application, transmission of communication is to be rejected except from those communication partners on the receipt-allowed communication partner registering table proposed.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Maruyama and Kida fails to teach or suggest a communication terminal device wherein for a receipt-rejected communication partner, creating a list of image information showing a plurality of rejected communications from the receipt-rejected communication partner including for each rejected communication from the receipt-rejected communication partner the date and time of the rejected communication as provided by the subject matter of independent claim 1 of the present application.

Independent claims 2-4, 17-20 and 39-42 are patentably distinct from the cited art for at least similar reasons.

Accordingly, for at least the above-stated reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1-4, 17-20 and 39-42, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentable over the cited art.

In view of the amendments to the remarks hereinabove, Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant earnestly solicits the allowance of the application.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition. The Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required in connection with this amendment and to credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

Koichiro MAEMURA, S.N. 09/653,994
Page 25

Dkt. No. 2271/62975

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner
is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul Teng, Reg. No. 40,837
Attorney for Applicant
Cooper & Dunham LLP
Tel.: (212) 278-0400